

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/538,203	06/09/2005	Thomas Juestel	DE 020311	1821	
24737 PHILIPS INTE	7590 10/07/200 ELLECTUAL PROPER	EXAM	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3001			WIESE, NOAH S		
BRIARCLIFF	MANOR, NY 10510	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			1793		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/07/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/538,203	JUESTEL ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
NOAH S. WIESE	1793	

	NOAH S. WIESE	1793					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 17 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	bly was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this tion, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the tion in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request thinued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time						
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. 							
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MEPE 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set fort in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any serined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for							
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a							
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	sorresponding number of finally reje	ottod ciairris.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).				
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 							
7. \(\) For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 1-3.5.7.8,11-13 and 15-18.		be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>9-10</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 4 and 6. AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. In affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 4.13(d)(1).							
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. \(\subseteq The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached sheet.							
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:							
/Jerry A Lorengo/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793	/Noah S Wiese/ Examiner, Art Unit 1793						

Applicant argues that rejected claims 9 and 10 are allowable because they are dependent from allowable claim 8. However, the claims are not allowable because they not only further limit claim 8, but also bring back in the element Sr that was previously removed from the allowable claim. Thus, the depenent claims 9 and 10 contain limitations that both further limit an allowable claim and cause the claims to read on the prior art in certain embodiments. Therefore, though the claims do depend from an allowable claim, they are not patentably distinct over the prior art of record.